

PL



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/858,004	05/14/2001	Meng-Lan Hsu	1981003	2050
7590 11/18/2004			EXAMINER	
Keith Kline PRO-TECHTOR INTERNATIONAL SERVICES 20775 Norada Court Saratoga, CA 95070-3018			GELAGAY, SHEWAYE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2133	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/858,004

Applicant(s)

HSU, MENG-LAN

Examiner

Shewaye Gelagay

Art Unit

2133

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner *for the abstract is not descriptive.*
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 5/14/01 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) <u>0</u>    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-18 have been examined.

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "2" has been used to designate both Reader and Slot, in Figure 4. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: the reader microcontroller unit 21 on page 8, line 24. Figure 6 does not have a reader microcontroller unit 21. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being

amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The specification is inconsistent with the drawings, referring to line 2 page 9, applicant refers keyboard reader microcontroller unit 21. However, figure 6, shows keyboard reader microcontroller unit labeled 24. Appropriate correction is required.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: "LDC" on page 8 line 20, should be spelled "LCD." Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claims 1 and 6 are objected to because of the following informalities:

As per claim 1:

Line 10, the article "an" should be changed to "a".

As per claim 6:

Line 21, the article "an" should be changed to "a".

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2133

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. Claims 2 and 7 recite the limitation "number of the card encryption code". Applicant did not define the term "number of the card encryption code" distinctly in the claim or in the specification. It is therefore being corrected to "number of digits of the card encryption code" to avoid ambiguity. (The correction is given in light of the submitted specification).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gray United States Letters Patent Number 6,367,017.

As per claim 1:

Gray teaches a verification method for assuring security of a card encryption code in an IC card, wherein the user inserts an IC card into a reader and then a terminal verification process and an IC card verification process are performed, comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2133

a. providing a gate; (Figure 3A-3C; Col. 6; line 14) (the office has interpreted the "gate" as "logical switch". The interpretation has been given based on the fact that both the gate and the switch perform the same function)

b. interrupting the data transformation between the keyboard and the computer by a reader microcontroller unit (Reader MCU) through the gate; (Col. 7; lines 17-22)

c. displaying an message to inform the user to input card encryption code; (Col. 7, lines 26-27)

d. receiving a card encryption code from the user through a keyboard; and (Col. 7; lines 27-28)

e. transferring the card encryption code data to the reader microcontroller unit by the keyboard microcontroller unit (K/B MCU). (Col. 6, lines 35-36; this password is entered via the keyboard and provided to the verification unit)

As per claim 6:

Gray teaches a verification method for assuring security of card encryption code in an IC card, wherein the user inserts an IC card into a reader and then a terminal verification process and an IC card verification process are performed, comprising the steps of:

a. interrupting data transformation between a keyboard and a computer by a keyboard reader microcontroller unit (K/B Reader MCU); (Col. 7; lines 17-22)

b. displaying an message to inform the user to input card encryption code; (Col. 7, lines 26-27)

Art Unit: 2133

c. receiving a card encryption code from the user through a keyboard; and (Col. 7; lines 27-28)

d. the keyboard reader microcontroller unit receiving the card encryption code. (Col. 6, lines 35-36; this password is entered via the keyboard and provided to the verification unit)

***Claim Rejections - 35 US C § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray United States Letters Patent Number 6,367,017 in view of Chlan et al. United States Letters Patent Number 6,385,642.

As per claim 2:

Gray teaches all the subject matter described above. In addition, Gray discloses a method further comprising the steps of:

g. transferring the card encryption code data to the IC card by the reader microcontroller unit; (Col. 8, lines 13-14)

h. the IC card determining whether the card encryption code is correct; if no, the process returning to step b; if yes, the verification of the card encryption code is complete. (Col. 8, lines 15-16)

Gray does not explicitly disclose the reader microcontroller unit determining whether a number of the card encryption code is correct; if no, the process returning to step c; if yes, performing the following step.

Chlan et al. in analogous art, however, teach a method to locally validate the login information, such as by making sure the correct number and types of digits were entered by the user in the username and password fields. If the information does not pass local validation processing, the login page is re-sent to the user with an error message. (Col. 6, lines 29-34)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Gray to include a method wherein the reader microcontroller unit determining whether a number of the card encryption code is correct; if no, the process returning to step c; if yes, performing the following step. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to check if the number of digits of the encryption code is correct or not before sending it for validation to the IC card. This way, the user will get a message promptly to input the correct password or PIN in case of invalid entry.

As per claim 3:

Gray and Chlan et al. teach all the subject matter described above. In addition, Gray discloses a method further comprising the steps of:

i. the reader microcontroller unit causing the data between the keyboard and the computer to be transferred normally by the gate; and (Col. 8, lines 2-4)



Art Unit: 2133

j. the computer providing services under authority to the user. (Col. 7, lines 3-5)

As per claim 5:

Gray and Chlan et al. teach all the subject matter described above. In addition, Gray discloses a method wherein the computer is a personal computer. (Col. 3, lines 59-60)

As per claim 7:

Gray teaches a verification method for assuring security of card encryption code in an IC card, further comprising the steps of:

f. transferring the card encryption code data to the IC card by the reader microcontroller unit; and (Col. 8, lines 13-14)

g. the IC card determining whether the card encryption code is correct; if no, the process returning to step a; if yes, the verification of the card encryption code is complete. (Col. 8, lines 15-16)

Gray does not explicitly disclose the keyboard reader microcontroller unit determining whether the number of the card encryption code is correct; if no, the process returning to step b; if yes, performing the following step.

Chlan et al. in analogous art, however, teach a method to locally validate the login information, such as by making sure the correct number and types of digits were entered by the user in the username and password fields. If the information does not pass local validation processing, the login page is re-sent to the user with an error message. (Col. 6, lines 29-34)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Gray to include a method wherein the keyboard reader microcontroller unit determining whether the number of the card encryption code is correct; if no, the process returning to step b; if yes, performing the following step. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to check if the number of digits of the encryption code is correct or not before sending it for validation to the IC card. This way, the user will get a message promptly to input the correct password or PIN in case of invalid entry.

As per claim 8:

Gray and Chlan et al. teach all the subject matter described above. In addition, Gray discloses a verification method for assuring security of card encryption code in an IC card as, further comprising the steps of:

h. causing the data between the keyboard and the computer to be transferred normally by the keyboard reader microcontroller unit; (Col. 8, lines 2-4)

i. the computer providing services under authority to the user. (Col. 7, lines 3-5)

As per claim 10:

Gray and Chlan et al. teach all the subject matter described above. In addition, Gray discloses a method wherein the computer is a personal computer. (Col. 3, lines 59-60)

12. Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray United States Letters Patent Number 6,367,017 in view of Chlan et al. United

Art Unit: 2133

States Letters Patent Number 6,385,642 and further in view of Weinstein United States Letters Patent Number 6,470,451.

As per claim 4

Both references, Gray and Chlan et al., teach all the subject matter as described above. Neither of the references, however, explicitly disclose a method wherein the displayed message of the reader microcontroller unit is that the message is displayed on a liquid crystal display.

Weinstein in analogous art, however, teach a card reader with a liquid crystal display (LCD) screen on which it can display information (Figure 1, item 16)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Gray to include a method wherein the displayed message of the reader microcontroller unit is that the message is displayed on a liquid crystal display. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Weinstein (Col. 3, line 1-2) in order to use the LCD as a conventional purpose of displaying information to the card holder. This way, the LCD can be used to ask the card holder to enter a password or a PIN number through the keyboard or to inform the card holder to input a correct password or PIN in case of invalid entry.

As per claim 9:

Both references, Gray and Chlan et al., teach all the subject matter as described above. Neither of the references, however, explicitly disclose a method wherein the

Art Unit: 2133

displayed message of the keyboard reader microcontroller unit is that the message is displayed on a liquid crystal display.

Weinstein in analogous art, however, teach a card reader with a liquid crystal display (LCD) screen on which it can display information (Figure 1, item 16)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Gray to include a method wherein the displayed message of the keyboard reader microcontroller unit is that the message is displayed on a liquid crystal display. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Weinstein (Col. 3, line 1-2) in order to use the LCD as a conventional purpose of displaying information to the card holder. This way, the LCD can be used to ask the card holder to enter a password or a PIN number through the keyboard or to inform the card holder to input a correct password or PIN in case of invalid entry.

13. Claims 11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray United States Letters Patent Number 6,367,017 in view of Iijima United States Letters Patent Number 5,288,978.

As per claim 11:

Gray teaches a verification system for assuring security of card encryption code in an IC card, comprising:

a gate for controlling data transformation between a keyboard and a computer;  
(Figure 3A-3C; Col. 6; line 14)

a computer connected to the gate (Figure 2, item 24c), after the verification of card encryption code, the computer providing services under authority; (Col. 7, lines 3-5)

a reader connected to the gate and a verification device; (Figure 2) the reader including at least a reader microcontroller unit and a slot; (Figure 2, item 60 and item 68)

a keyboard connected to the gate (Figure 2, item 24d) and including at least one keyboard microcontroller, and (Col. 17, line 9)

a verification device connected to the reader and for performing the terminal verification process and the IC card verification process; (Figure 2, item 62) wherein the user inserts the IC card into the reader; (Col. 7, lines 15-16) then the reader microcontroller unit interrupts the transformation of data between the keyboard and the computer by the gate; (Col. 7; lines 17-22) the card encryption code data inputted from the keyboard by the user is encoded by the keyboard microcontroller unit (Col. 7; lines 27-28) and then is transferred to the reader microcontroller unit; (Col. 6, lines 35-36) the reader microcontroller unit transfers the card encryption code data to the IC card for verification so as to prevent the card encryption code entering into the computer. (Col. 8, lines 13-14)

Gray further discloses a command is issued to the verification unit initiating access authorization. (Col. 7, lines 14-15) Gary does not explicitly disclose a system wherein the verification device performs the terminal verification process and the IC card verification process.

Ijemma in analogous art, however, disclose the designation key data that is used by the terminal device for authenticating IC card, and the internal key data that is used for authenticating the terminal device. (Col. 4, lines 5-7)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Gray to include a system wherein the verification device performs the terminal verification process and the IC card verification process. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Ijemma (Col. 1, lines 55-56) in order to provide mutual authentication system which increases the security of the authentication data and the card encryption code.

As per claim 15:

Gray teaches a verification system for assuring security of card encryption code in an IC card, comprising:

a computer, after the verification of card encryption code, the computer providing services under authority; (Col. 7, lines 3-5)

a reader connected to the computer, a keyboard and a verification device;  
(Figure 2) the reader including at least a keyboard reader microcontroller unit and a slot;  
(Figure 2, item 60 and item 68)

a keyboard connected to the reader; and (Figure 2, item 24d)

a verification device connected to the reader (Figure 2) and for performing the terminal verification process and the IC card verification process; (Figure 2, item 62)

Art Unit: 2133

wherein user inserted the IC card into the reader; (Col. 7, lines 15-16) then the keyboard reader microcontroller unit interrupts the transformation of data between the keyboard and the computer; (Col. 7; lines 17-22) the card encryption code data inputted from the keyboard by the user is transferred directly to the IC card by keyboard reader microcontroller unit for verification so as to prevent the card encryption code from entering into the computer. (Col. 8, lines 13-14)

Gray further discloses a command is issued to the verification unit initiating access authorization. (Col. 7, lines 14-15) Gary does not explicitly disclose a system wherein the verification device performs the terminal verification process and the IC card verification process.

Ijemma in analogous art, however, disclose the designation key data that is used by the terminal device for authenticating IC card, and the internal key data that is used for authenticating the terminal device. (Col. 4, lines 5-7)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Gray to include a system wherein the verification device performs the terminal verification process and the IC card verification process. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Ijemma (Col. 1, lines 55-56) in order to provide mutual authentication system which increases the security of the authentication data and the card encryption code.

Art Unit: 2133

14. Claims 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray United States Letters Patent Number 6,367,017 in view of Ijima United States Letters Patent Number 5,288,978 and further in view of Weinstein United States Letters Patent Number 6,470,451

As per claim 12

Both references, Gray and Ijima, teach all the subject matter as described above. Neither of the references, however, explicitly disclose a system wherein the reader has a liquid crystal display; as the user inputs the card encryption code, the liquid crystal display is in a display condition for informing the user.

Weinstein in analogous art, however, teach a card reader with a liquid crystal display (LCD) screen on which it can display information (Figure 1, item 16)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Gray to include a system wherein the reader has a liquid crystal display; as the user inputs the card encryption code, the liquid crystal display is in a display condition for informing the user. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Weinstein (Col. 3, line 1-2) in order to use the LCD as a conventional purpose of displaying information to the card holder. This way, the LCD can be used to ask the card holder to enter a password or a PIN number through the keyboard or to inform the card holder to input a correct password or PIN in case of invalid entry.

As per claim 16:



Both references, Gray and Ijemma, teach all the subject matter as described above. Neither of the references, however, explicitly disclose a system wherein the reader has a liquid crystal display; as the user inputs the card encryption code, the liquid crystal display is in a display condition for informing the user.

Weinstein in analogous art, however, teach a card reader with a liquid crystal display (LCD) screen on which it can display information (Figure 1, item 16)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Gray to include a system wherein the reader has a liquid crystal display; as the user inputs the card encryption code, the liquid crystal display is in a display condition for informing the user. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Weinstein (Col. 3, line 1-2) in order to use the LCD as a conventional purpose of displaying information to the card holder. This way, the LCD can be used to ask the card holder to enter a password or a PIN number through the keyboard or to inform the card holder to input a correct password or PIN in case of invalid entry.

15. Claims 13, 14, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray United States Letters Patent Number 6,367,017 in view of Ijemma United States Letters Patent Number 5,288,978 and further in view of Clark United States Letters Patent Number 5,815,577.

As per claim 13:

Art Unit: 2133

Both references, Gray and Ijemma, teach all the subject matter as described above. Neither of the references, however, explicitly disclose a verification system wherein the interfaces between all the elements are based on general used protocols, such as RS232, USB, PS/2, or parallel ports.

Clark in analogous art, however, teaches a system suitably equipped to interface with a USB bus, an IEEE 1394 firewire bus, or other general purpose bus of a PC via a connection. (Col. 22, lines 29-32)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Gray to include a system wherein a verification system wherein the interfaces between all the elements are based on general used protocols, such as RS232, USB, PS/2, or parallel ports. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, because it is necessary to connect communications links between the computer, card reader and the keyboard.

As per claim 14:

Gray, Ijemma and Clark teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition, Gray discloses a system wherein the computer is a personal computer. (Col. 3, lines 59-60)

As per claim 17:

Both references, Gray and Ijemma, teach all the subject matter as described above. Neither of the references, however, explicitly disclose a verification system

Art Unit: 2133

wherein the interfaces between all the elements are according to general used protocols, such as RS232, USB, PS/2, or parallel ports.

Clark in analogous art, however, teaches a system suitably equipped to interface with a USB bus, an IEEE 1394 firewire bus, or other general purpose bus of a PC via a connection. (Col. 22, lines 29-32)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Gray to include a system wherein the interfaces between all the elements are according to general used protocols, such as RS232, USB, PS/2, or parallel ports. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, because it is necessary to connect communications links between the computer, card reader and the keyboard.

As per claim 18:

Gray, Ijemma and Clark teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition, Gray discloses a system wherein the computer is a personal computer. (Col. 3, lines 59-60)

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shewaye Gelagay whose telephone number is 571-272-4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on 571-272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2133

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

11/04/04

Shewaye Gelagay *SG*  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2133



GUY J. LAMARRE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER